

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,169	10/22/2001	Hung-Liang Chiu	1007-013	1606
22898	7590 02/28/2006		EXAMINER	
THE LAW OFFICES OF MIKIO ISHIMARU			LANEAU, RONALD	
SUITE 330	AMINO REAL		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUNNYVAL	SUNNYVALE, CA 94087		3627	
•			DATE MAILED: 02/28/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/044,169	CHIU ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ronald Laneau	3627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address	s				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply to dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS tute, cause the application to become ABAND	ION. ie timely filed from the mailing date of this commun DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16	November 2005						
	nis action is non-final.						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims	pano gasy.c,	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application	•						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Vor election requirement						
o) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	ror election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ad	ccepted or b) \square objected to by the	ne Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Off	ice Action or form PTO-15	52.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) All b) Some * c) None of:	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		cation No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr			е				
application from the International Bure	•	J					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	eived.					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ						
 P)	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	il Date al Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	(p					

Art Unit: 3627

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 11/9/05 has been entered. Claims 1-8 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauser (US 6,536,659 B1) in view of Yu (US 2002/0120535 A1).

Yu was cited in previous action.

Hauser discloses a method for processing a return product comprising the steps of: constructing a RMA file (see column 3, lines 45-60) including product category data, assembly data, and client data (see column 4, lines 8-15); comparing returned product to check for lacking assemblies (see paragraph bridging columns 4-5); charging the client for a product return that is lacking assemblies (see column 5, lines 21-35); properly functioning products are identified and exported via production line (see block 42, see column 6, lines 7-10); repairing (salvaging; see column 5, lines 45-57) a returned product that needs repair; identifying unrepairable returned products and salvaging any available components of the returned product (see column 5, lines 55-57); invoicing the client for charges (see column 5, lines 30-35)., and communication via an intranet or the Internet (see Figure 5). Hauser does not explicitly disclose repairing products not functioning properly but Yu discloses a repair execution system (RES) connected to the return

material authorization (RMA) processor for administering and tracking a repair activity (process) of the returned product according to repair data provided by the repair center (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the repair execution system for repairing the return product as taught by Yu into the system of Hauser because it would provide a website system for providing on-line data exchange and a collaborative service for return and repair processes via a network.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hauser does not disclose "repairing products not functioning properly." Contrary to Applicant's arguments, the newly cited reference (Yu) is used to disclose such element of the claim. As a result, claims 1-8 remain rejected.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 86

Ronald Laneau 2/16/06

Art Unit 3627

rl